

30 January 1985

Dear

Enclosed is the latest and hopefully the last draft of our Panel's report for your review. (I plan to classify the final report, but I have removed the classified tables from the enclosure to facilitate handling during coordination.) I believe the report accurately reflects the Panel's discussions, findings, and recommendations, although some of the Panel members' suggestions were not included for the reasons discussed later in this letter. Your telephone concurrence is requested, but if you feel that substantive changes are needed, please give them to me in the form of substitute text that can be directly inserted into the report. Also, please include some explanation of why you think the change is needed. Any suggested changes will be coordinated with other Panel members. If they agree, the new material will be added. In case of disagreement, I will try to reconcile the differences and if not successful, will include the suggested change in the report as a minority view.

My goal is to deliver the report to Mr. Fitzwater within a week. We are attempting to schedule a briefing on our report for John McMahon after he returns from travel on 19 February. You will be advised when we have a firm date so that you can arrange to participate if possible. The following comments relate to suggestions made by various Panel members that were not included in the enclosed report. There was discussion of some of these suggestions during our last meeting, but they are summarized here for the benefit of those Panel members who could not attend.

Jim Croke believes that the architectural approach planned by ODP has some weaknesses and a broad effort should be undertaken to map out transitional designs to meet future Agency needs. The majority of the Panel members felt that, while there may be some correlation between space and architecture, this was never studied by the Panel because ODP's planned architecture was accepted as proposed. The architectural question therefore was considered irrelevant to the space issue, except to the extent that planned architecture would be affected by the Panel's recommendations. The report recognizes that ODP and OC must develop a modified architectural approach to support the off-site location of some computing services.

Several suggestions were made that the Panel recommend a modeling effort be undertaken in the course of examining architectural alternatives. The report did not include this specific recommendation. It was felt that sound engineering practices would dictate where models could be productively used by ODP and OC and nothing would be gained from such a Panel recommendation.

[redacted] felt that ODP should plan to replace all old technology computers concurrent with the move to the new Headquarters addition in 1987. This would involve accelerating the schedule for acquiring 15 new machines presently planned by ODP and acquiring 7 additional new machines to replace 13 old machines that would have been retained under the ODP plan. Bringing 22 new machines online by 1987 appeared to be unrealistic operationally and budget-wise. Furthermore, acquiring the 7 additional machines would not be justified in terms of space savings (only 1,450 sq.ft. would be gained at a cost of \$35 million). Accordingly, the report did not recommend complete conversion to new technology machines by 1987 as suggested.

Please call me if you want to discuss any part of the report
[redacted] An early concurrence or comment would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

C. D. May, Jr.

Enclosure